



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/967,221	09/28/2001	James Morrow	10407/519	7155

30076 7590 07/18/2003

BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER & STEINER, LLP
SUITE 711
1880 CENTURY PARK EAST
LOS ANGELES, CA 90067

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

JONES, SCOTT E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3713	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	CS
	09/967,221	MORROW ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Scott E. Jones	3713	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 May 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-138 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-138 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 06 May 2003 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the request for reconsideration filed on May 6, 2003 in which applicant corrects drawings and responds to the claim rejections. Claims 1-138 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-138 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (U.S. 5,429,361). Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has a display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system. Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine. Raven et al. lacks explicitly disclosing:

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138:

- Integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98:

- a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99:

- calibration software that enables the additional processor to calibrate the display of system information on the display screen.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116:

- the systems interface utilizes touchscreen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network.

Regarding Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, 125:

- the gaming display screen includes a small region that, when selected, activates the system interface.

Regarding Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131:

- the display process that runs the gaming interface supports a graphic user interface based wagering game.

Regarding Claims 36, 63, and 96:

- the converter card utilizes I²C hardware and signaling.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134:

- integrating the systems interface via the display screen lowers overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduces maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts.

Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, integrating gameplay and

service systems into a single interface display system were well known. It would have been obvious to integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information. One would be motivated to integrate the gaming and service systems into one display system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 6, 38, 65, 74, and 98, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices was well known. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to utilize a Y adapter that allows communication between the display screen and both the at least one processor and the additional processor. One would be motivated to utilize a Y adapter to allow communication between the display and one of the processors because a Y adapter provides a simple solution to switching communication from one processor to the other, thereby, allowing the system to eliminate at least one redundant connection between the display and one of the processors.

Regarding Claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, calibration software and hardware for a computer display were notoriously well known in the art.

Regarding Claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, 116, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, touchscreen technology was well known. It would have been obvious to modernize Raven et al. with a systems interface utilizing touchscreen technology for inputting and accessing system information in the systems network. One would be motivated to

utilize touchscreen technology in a gaming and servicing system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, 125, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, providing a gaming display screen including a small region (icon or GUI button) that, when selected, activates the system interface is notoriously well known in the art. One would be motivated to use an icon or GUI button on a display screen to activate a particular system in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 33, 60, 93, and 131, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, the display process that runs the gaming interface supporting a graphic user interface based wagering game is notoriously well known in the gaming art.

Regarding Claims 36, 63, and 96, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to use existing engineering guidelines to modernize existing converter card hardware and signaling with I²C hardware and signaling. One would be motivated to do so in order to modernize an existing system to the present state of technology.

Regarding Claims 40, 67, and 134, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts. Reducing overall costs by eliminating hardware and reducing maintenance costs are a byproduct of modernizing an existing system to the present state of technology.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed May 6, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. The corrected or substitute drawings were received on May 6, 2003. These drawings are accepted.
6. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection to claims 1-138 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raven et al. (U.S. 5,429,361).
7. Regarding independent claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138, applicant alleges the examiner's assertion that "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information" is well known is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Walker et al. (U.S. 6,068,552) shows a game screen display (210) which doubles as the game screen and the game customization screen as shown in figures 3-6. Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner's contention that "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information" was well known in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Furthermore, Ronin et al. (U.S. 6,083,105) shows this feature in figures 6 and 7, Franchi (U.S. 5,770,533) shows this feature in figure 13, Houriet, Jr. et al. (U.S. 5,575,717) shows this feature in figures 1-4 and column 2, lines 20-36, and Walker et al. (U.S. 6,293,866) teaches this feature in column 5, lines 1-18 and column 7, lines 1-25. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information" is well known in the art.

8. Additionally, regarding claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68-69, 83-84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138, applicant alleges Raven et al. does not teach or suggest, “integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. Raven et al. (U.S. 5,429,361) clearly suggests to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to “integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information” simply because user interface (12) is mounted directly next to the gaming display on gaming machine (10). Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that “integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information” is well known in the art.

9. Regarding claims 6, 38, 65, and 98, applicant alleges the examiner’s assertion that “utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices was well known” is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Scott-Jackson et al. (U.S. 5,714,981) teaches how two joysticks (206a and 206b) can be coupled to a single D-plug (204) in figure 2 via a Y-adapter (not shown). Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner’s contention that “utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices” was well known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that “utilizing a Y adapter to allow communication to a plurality of devices” is well known in the art.

10. Regarding claims 7, 39, 66, 75, and 99, applicant alleges the examiner’s assertion that “calibration software and hardware for a computer display were notoriously well known in the

“art” is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Fu et al. (U.S. 6,292,171) discloses a method and apparatus for calibrating a computer-generated projected image displayed on a computer screen. Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner’s contention that “calibration software and hardware for a computer display” was well known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that “calibration software and hardware for a computer display” is well known in the art.

11. Regarding claims 8, 18, 44, 76, 85, 106, and 116, applicant alleges the examiner’s assertion that “touchscreen technology was well known at the time of applicant’s invention” is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Walker et al. (U.S. 6,068,552) discloses this feature in figures 3, 4a, 4b, 5, 6, and column 4, lines 10-12. Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner’s contention that “touchscreen technology” was well known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that “touchscreen technology” is well known in the art.

12. Regarding claims 10, 27, 54, 77, 87, 108, and 125, applicant alleges the examiner’s assertion that “providing a gaming display screen including a small region (icon or GUI button) that, when selected, activates the system interface is notoriously well known in the art” is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Walker et al. (U.S. 6,068,552) discloses this feature in the customization menu of figures 3, 4a, 4b, 5, and 6. Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has

provided a reference in support of examiner's contention that "providing a gaming display screen including a small region (icon or GUI button) that, when selected, activates the system interface" was well known in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that "providing a gaming display screen including a small region (icon or GUI button) that, when selected, activates the system interface" is well known in the art.

13. Regarding claims 33, 60, 93, and 131, applicant alleges the examiner's assertion that "the display process that runs the gaming interface supporting a graphic user interface based wagering game is notoriously well known in the gaming art" is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Walker et al. (U.S. 6,068,552) discloses this feature in the customization menu of figures 3, 4a, 4b, 5, and 6. Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner's contention that "the display process that runs the gaming interface supporting a graphic user interface based wagering game" was well known in the art at the time of applicant's invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that "the display process that runs the gaming interface supporting a graphic user interface based wagering game" is well known in the art.

14. Regarding claims 36, 63, and 96, applicant alleges the examiner's assertion that "to use existing engineering guidelines to modernize existing converter card hardware and signaling with I²C hardware and signaling" was notoriously well known in the gaming art is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, applicant admits this feature is well known in the specification on pages 10 and 11 which states,

“...uses industry standard I²C hardware and signaling...”. Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner’s contention that “to use existing engineering guidelines to modernize existing converter card hardware and signaling with I²C hardware and signaling” was well known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that “to use existing engineering guidelines to modernize existing converter card hardware and signaling with I²C hardware and signaling” is well known in the art.

15. Regarding claims 40, 67, and 134, applicant alleges the examiner’s assertion that “it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts.” is completely unsupported by the art of record. However, the examiner respectfully disagrees. In particular, Stubben et al. (U.S. 4,324,401) teaches “sharing memory and symbol generation circuitry by both moving and playfield objects...thereby, eliminating additional memory elements, significantly reduces cost in light of the present expense...” Therefore, upon the formal request of applicant, the examiner has provided a reference in support of examiner’s contention that “it would have been obvious that integrating the systems interface via the display screen would lower overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduce maintenance costs due to fewer hardware parts.” was well known in the art at the time of applicant’s invention. Therefore, the examiner maintains the holding from Office Action, Paper No. 7, that “reducing overall system costs due to hardware elimination and reduced maintenance” is well known in the art.

16. Therefore, for the reasons discussed hereinabove, the examiner maintains the rejection as stated in Office Action, Paper No. 7.

Conclusion

17. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott E. Jones whose telephone number is (703) 308-7133. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:30 A.M. - 5:30 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael O'Neill, Acting SPE can be reached on (703) 308-1148. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9302 for regular communications and (703) 872-9303 for After Final communications.

Application/Control Number: 09/967,221
Art Unit: 3713

Page 12

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

SEJ

sej

July 16, 2003



MICHAEL O'NEILL
PRIMARY EXAMINER